DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 587 EA 008 909

AUTHOR Crowson, Robert L.
TITLE Educational Planning and School Reform: A Report on West Germany.
PUB DATE Sep 75
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adoption (Ideas); *Educational Change; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Higher Education
IDENTIFIERS *West Germany

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the status of comprehensive planning for educational reform in the Federal Republic of Germany. Although a late entrant among the European nations engaged in school reform, West Germany is now heavily involved in the problems and politics of structural change. A "General Plan for Education," calling for widespread alteration in the nation's educational system was approved by the various state and federal governments in late 1973. The first section of this paper briefly reviews the background of West Germany's planning effort and the major provision of the "Plan." The second section assesses the current (mid-1975) situation in the implementation of German educational reform. The third, and major, section seeks to draw some general conclusions about educational planning and the initiation of structural change. In the author's view, the German experience indicates the need for carefully designed strategies for implementation as a closely related function of plan development. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131587

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND SCHOOL REFORM: A REPORT ON WEST GERMANY

Robert L. Crowson
Assistant Professor of
Urban Sciences and Education
College of Urban Sciences
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

September, 1975

EA 008 909

Robert L. Crowson*

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND SCHOOL REFORM: A REPORT ON WEST GERMANY

Introduction

This paper examines the status of comprehensive planning for educational reform in the Federal Republic of Germany. Although a late entrant among the European nations engaged in school reform, West Germany is now heavily involved in the problems and politics of structural change. A General Plan for Education, calling for some rather widespread alterations in the nation's educational system, was approved by the various federal and state governments in late 1973.[1] By mid-1975, at the time of this review of education in Germany, two years of discussion and involvement with the Plan, plus the various supporting and "spin-off" papers involved in its implementation, have now provided a useful vehicle for some preliminary statements about the comprehensive planning process. In its first section this paper reviews very briefly the background of West Germany's planning effort and the major provisions of the Plan itself. A second section assesses the current (mid-1975) situation in the implementation of German educational reform; while a third and the major section of the paper seeks to draw

*Dr. Crowson is an Assistant Professor of Urban Sciences and Education and Acting Director, of the Urban Planning and Policy Program, College of Urban Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. During the summer of 1975, Dr. Crowson studied the status of educational planning and reform in West Germany under the support of a senior Fulbright-Hays research grant.

some general conclusions about educational planning and the initiation of structural change. In the author's view the German experience indicates clearly the need for carefully designed strategies for implementation as a closely concomitant function of plan development.

Germany's General Plan for Education

In the mid-1960's, Torsten Husén cited the Federal Republic as Europe's prime example of a failure to plan appropriately for the modernization of elementary and secondary schooling.[2] In 1972, a now much-referred to OECD report on West German education noted that the "breakneck economic growth" of the nation has gone ahead with little change in educational structures and that in "an age when mass secondary and higher education are being rapidly developed in other advanced states, Germany has made do with a system that has effectively shut off some 90% of the children from the possibility of entering university-level education."[3]

By the time of the OECD report, however, Germany had already become deeply involved in the discussion of proposals for school reform and had begun to undertake, for the first time in its modern history, the task of national planning for education. In mid-1970, in accordance with a change in the federal constitution, a Federal-State Commission for Educational Planning had been established. In June of 1973, after three years of work, this Commission produced the General Plan for Education. The General Plan was an impressive accomplishment for Germany--a first step, in many minds, in the restructuring and unification of the nation's entire educational apparatus according to some common-goals, well-considered reforms, and good planning.[4] By 1975, the General Plan has been followed by the development of comprehensive reform proposals in almost all of the individual German states--adapting the national guidelines to varying local conditions, population needs, and political ideologies.

Substantively, West Germany's national and state school reform plans call for changes akin to the alterations being considered and implemented elsewhere in Europe--reforms which will hopefully loosen the traditionally selective and elitist bent of the educational system. A major objective is to extend a reform begun during the Weimar period, wherein a common, four-year primary school experience (Grundschule) was established for all children. Current proposals would seek a similar commonality in post-primary education--through a breakdown in the traditional tripartite structure of Hauptschule, Realshule, and Gymnasium.[5]

Much of the discussion of a new form for post-primary instruction hinges upon the idea of the Gesamtschule (comprehensive school), a melding of the tripartite system into an approach to education which will hopefully permit many improved opportunities for individual inclinations and qualities to be properly developed.[6] The purpose of it all is wrapped in a single word which is heard frequently in West Germany these days--"Chancegleichkeit," or equality of opportunity. No longer, hopefully, with a comprehensivization of schooling will a decision have to be made at age ten regarding pupil placement in one of the three types of post-primary institutions; rather, the new structure will provide a secondary education stage I (using the Gesamtschule) which gives youngsters, until age sixteen, a chance to pursue a common general education as well as a chance to "test-out" individual talents. A secondary education stage II will follow, with opportunities at that point for young people to enter vocational or technical schools, to enter apprenticeships, or to prepare for the university.

A second, and accompanying objective of General Plan reform is to remove much of the rigidity which traditionally characterzies schooling for occupational advancement in Germany. This is a concept exemplified by "der zweite Bildungsweg" an opening up of alternative routes to the university, other than the hallowed Abitur examination following years of study at the Gymnasium. For the first time,

university entrance may be approached through technical studies (the Fachoberschule followed by the Fachhochschule) as a choice other than the traditional academic route. Reforms which are in keeping with the idea of the zweite Bildungsweg include as well the shaping of a heretofore almost nonexistent system of adult and continuing education for Germany plus the development of a, now equally nonexistent, capacity for educational counseling--particularly during the important formative years of secondary education stage I. Hopefully, in addition, the prestige and appeal of differing forms of higher education (e.g., advanced technical schools, teacher training colleges, the highly academic institutions) will be equalized through the widespread creation of comprehensive universities (Gesamthochschulen).

Finally, a third set of reform proposals in the Plan fall into a grease-the-skids or remove-obstacles-to-chancegleichkeit category. Among these are a politically and technically very difficult effort to reform teacher preparation and the teacher reward structure, thereby muting a system which now attaches very great prestige and benefit to the Gymnasium teacher (the Studienrat) and making it possible to engage in the widespread training of teachers for the new curricular flexibility and openness demanded by the Gesamtschule. Chancegleichkeit will also be served, it is hoped, by expanding the opportunities for five-year-old children to attend elementary school from a fifty-four percent rate in 1970 to one hundred percent in 1985. In the nation which developed the idea of the kindergarten, opportunities to benefit from publicly supported pre-school training are severely limited. Similarly, the very cursory attention currently given to special education in Germany is, according to the planners, to be quickly remedied.

The Status of General Plan Implementation

Germany's General Plan for Education received approval from the heads of the the various federal and state governments in late 1973. By mid-1975, a number of

steps toward the implementation of educational reform had clearly been taken in many of the states (Länder). In general, however, throughout the Federal Republic it would appear that change is now proceeding very slowly and not without considerable opposition. Although some of the states, for example, have pushed hard toward the development of comprehensive secondary schools (most notably the strongly social democratic state of Hesse), the Gesamtschule in most regions is still considered a very shakey experiment. There are fewer Gesamtschulen in Germnay today (currently about 40) than existed a year or so ago.[7] All of the existing comprehensive schools are experimental, all are being closely evaluated, all are in the midst of curriculum development and role definition, and nearly all are being watched with increasing skepticism by other educators and by the general populace. An early mood of considerable optimism about the prospects for moving rapidly into the secondary education stage I reforms has now been replaced throughout the nation by a let's-go-slow attitude and "let's evaluate the results of the existing Gesamtschulen before going much further."

A major difficulty in eliminating the traditional, tripartite structure lies with the nation's teacher reward system. The General Plan, in its proposal for a secondary education stage I, asks for equalized salary schedules. However, teachers at the Gymnasia have always enjoyed much greater prestige, have been more highly educated, and have been paid better than their colleagues at the Haupt- and Realschulen. The Gymnasia teachers are understandably reluctant to see any diminution of their perquisites of pay and position. Thus they are active and influential spokesmen for a strongly conservative interest among many Germans who wish to preserve that most hallowed of elitist institutions. Despite recent strides toward diminishing the salary differentials between the three types of schools and despite some beginning efforts to combine the teacher training functions of the colleges of pedagogy and the universities, there have as yet been few successes

in equating the prestige and attractiveness of comprehensive school teaching with that of the Gymnasium.

A third obstacle to reform, it has developed, lies in the threat the secondary education plans pose for Germany's system of vocational training. A long-standing approach to job preparation in West Germany is a dual system of apprenticeship and formal schooling. Students who leave both the Hauptschule and the Realschule are expected to enter a long period of on-the-job preparation for specific occupational slots while continuing their formal schooling part-time, if at all. In effect, vocational education in Germany is traditionally left to the employer. It has been pointed out that there is a long and deep conflict in German society between the concepts of Bildung and Ausbildung--the formation of the mind and character as opposed to vocational training.[8] The schools and institutions of commerce and industry have very separate developmental functions. Only from the latter do young people expect highly intensive instruction for the jobs they are to fill. Critics of this system charge that the training is so heavily job-specific that German workers tend to be poorly adaptable to rapidly changing technologies and shifting job requirements. The plans for secondary education reform seek to strengthen the role of, and the years involved in, formal schooling--through the development of a strong, integrated system of vocational schools. While the hallowed apprenticeship system would not be abandoned, it would be more than balanced by a formalized vocational preparation process which emphasizes transferrable skills and occupational adaptability. Considerably complicating the implementation of this reform, however, is a split in the locus of governmental authority for vocational training. Under the existing apprenticeship system, occupational training is the responsibility of the various state and federal ministries of labor. Formal schooling is under the authority of the state education ministries. The secondary educational reforms would appear to result in

a diminution of the role and responsibility of the labor ministries in the development of Germany's work force, a role change they will not very willingly abide.

A fourth complication in the implementation of the General Plan stems from some current problems in the flow of students through Germany's educational system. An inviolate tradition of German education is the assurance given to persons who pass the Abitur examination (Abiturenten) that space shall be available for them at one of the nation's universities in their chosen field of study. At present, Germany's universities are all badly overcrowded in nearly every field, and a limited admissions policy ("numerus clausus") has been instituted throughout the nation. Abiturenten must now sometimes wait from one to five years for university entrance, depending upon the field.

This situation, it would appear, is in large part attributable to the existence of many more Abiturenten than ever before. Whereas only ten percent of each age cohort completed the Abitur examination a decade ago, about twenty-four percent of each age group passes the Abitur today.[9] In the midst of discussions concerning the need for improved chancegleichkeit it would appear that the traditional structure is already responding to societal pressure for an opening up of the elitist system. As a consequence, with the current excess of Abiturenten over university places, many conservatives are now arguing that further reform and a possible further enlargement of the pool of university entrants is unnecessary. This argument received even greater emphasis in discussions of the state of reform during mid-1975, as the slowing German economy gave evidence that it could no longer offer guaranteed employment at prestigeful positions to all of the nation's university graduates. With the press for space in higher education and with the beginnings of some concern about a potentially underemployed university work force, the feelings of great need and urgency surrounding the implementation of General Plan reforms are no longer very apparent.

A related barrier to implementation, finally, is the matter of budget. With evidence of a mid-1970 economic recession, the projected costs of the educational reform ideas outlined in the General Plan are of considerable concern. The structural alterations proposed for the nation's school system are expensive--calling for a doubling of expenditures for education between 1970 and 1975, calling for heavy increases in capital expenditures on school buildings (e.g., Gesamtschulen), and calling for an increase in the education share of the German gross national product from 4.8% in 1970 to 7.6% by 1985.[10] At a time of an apparent slowdown in the pace of the postwar German economic "miracle" and of currently rising unemployment, talk of heavy reallocations of government resources toward educational reform has now been substantially muted.

Germany's Educational Reform Experience: Some Lessons for Planners

Although the status of school reform in Germany in 1975 is a far cry from the projections for change put forth in the General Plan in 1973, the German experience in educational planning over the past two years offers us some interesting and informative observations. Implementation of the General Plan hasn't proceeded very far; but given the political and economic barriers to reform, and the very ambitious scope of the changes proposed, the lack of progress is not surprising. And despite its difficulties, the educational planning process has been extremely successful in one very important sense. Germany offers an unusual example of a major industrialized nation which has at least been able to produce a General Plan for Education and which has seen a very widespread development of supplementary plans at state and local levels. In few other nations has educational planning received as much acceptability, visibility, and informed discussion.

The lessons to be learned from the German experience, however, go beyond a recognition of the nation's success in getting educational planning "off-the-ground." It may be suggested that the German experience raises the following propositions concerning the educational planning process.

The Politics of Implementation

First, comprehensive plans for educational reform are apt to open themselves to a rather destructive politics of implementation, a circumstance of conflict based upon the existence of complex interlocking networks of vested interest. Germany's General Plan seeks an ambitious restructuring of the nation's entire primary through higher education system of schooling, between 1973 and 1985. Involved are questions concerning curricular reform, teacher preparation and teacher remuneration, pupil allocation, school construction and classification, higher education admissions, relations between education and industry, and a host of special "needs" areas (e.g., special education, kindergarten places) throughout the educational system. As this comprehensive design for reform currently pursues strategies of implementation, it has become apparent that the nation's planners have been inadequately attuned to the inordinate complexities of function and behavior surrounding current organizational relationships.

The prestigeful Gymnasium is supported by a teacher training system which is tied very closely to the traditionally conceived German university. Gymnasium teachers are trained very thoroughly in their areas of academic specialization; they are given little if any training by the university in education methods. However, the Gesamtschule, with its emphasis upon curriculum development and instructional flexibility has demonstrated the need for better training in the field of education--an area which has traditionally been left to the "practice-oriented" pedagogical colleges (pedogogische hochschulen) which produce the Hoch- and Realschule teachers. It has been recognized that to implement effectively the concept of the Gesamtschule, Germany must rework its system of teacher preparation--breaking down the deep schism between theory and practice which typically separates the style of teacher training found in the university from that found in the pedagogische hochschule. Plans for the development of Gesamthochshulen (comprehensive higher education institutions) do just this, but it will be some years before the nation is producing large numbers of the highly academically

trained and highly educational-practice-oriented individuals needed for successful, widespread implementation of the Gesamtschule idea.[11] The process of implementation is not at all simplified by the need for at least some degree of change in the nation's concept of the function of the university--for the power of the status quo among German university faculties is considerable. For an institutionalization of the comprehensive school idea to await a prior implementation of changes in teacher training dooms the General Plan to a very long and difficult time framework for fulfillment. Exemplifying the difficulty involved, for instance, is the fact that in many states two separate governmental bureaucracies are responsible for lower and for higher education, with notorious problems of communication and lack of coordination between them. Even when both areas of schooling are housed in the same ministry, officials in state after state point out their problems in getting the primary-secondary and tertiary sectors to work together.

Another network of traditon and interest surrouhding the educational reform movement involves problems of federalism and governmental prerogative. The General Plan was developed, and has been pushed, by the national government and particularly by the Social Democratic Party (SPD). Among the states and cities with an SPD majority there has been generally greater progress in the implementation of reform than in Christian Democrat (CDU) areas. The party differences, however, do not seem to present as great a barrier to General Plan implementation as do questions of federalism. Constitutionally, the eleven Länder are rather autonomously responsible for their own systems of schooling; they are very wary of federal encroachment into educational decision making and are committed to the maintenance of a very weak national ministry of education. Although the General Plan was an outgrowth of federal initiative within the Bund-Lander Comission, its implementation depends much more upon the support given it by a cooperative association of the states, called the standing conference of the ministers of education and cultural

nz der Kultusminister der Länder). The Standing Conference
l Plan and its very comprehensive reforms with considerable
portance to the Standing Conference is a need to protect
e possible development of a more powerful planning and
lity within the federal government, to protect the interests
tes from any possibilities of federal encroachment, and
naging involvement or unwanted publicity concerning the
itically controversial ideas in the General Plan.. Although
deas presented in the Plan, the standing conference staff
n their own interests, to push very vigorously for proposals
very precarious position atop the loose confederacy of

vested interest and contradictory viewpoint acting as a
on is wrapped in the plan's seemingly inocuous proposal for
arten.[12] The General Plan points out that in 1970, throughout
aces for five-year-olds were available for just 54.3% of
ildren. The Plan calls for an expansion of kindergarten
ve 70% of the five-year-olds by 1975, 85% by 1980, and 100%
eclining birth rates, and of a surplus of elementary
zed classrooms, these objectives should be within easy
expansion of kindergarten places would appear to be an
the Plan's push for greater educational opportunity.
is the less privileged child who is now least likely to
pre-school.[13]
need and feasibility, the kindergarten proposals face
or stumbling block is Germany's long tradition of private
to-five age group. Although pre-schools are widely available

(but much less so in rural areas), the kindergarten movement is generally thought of by the German populace as a voluntary parental decision and, even more importantly, as a decision with religious connotations. Most opportunities for preschooling (particularly in the politically influential states of Bavaria and heavily populated North Rhine-Westphalia) are denominationally identifiable as either Catholic or Protestant. Although parents today are inclined to send their youngsters to whatever school most appeals to them, whether the religious identification fits their own or not, the denominational and private emphasis in kindergarten education is still very strong.[14] In a nation which rather thoroughly removes the parent from decisional control over the course of education, with the onset of formal schooling at age six, German parents seem strongly of a mind to protect their right to decide whether their five-year-olds should go to school at all, and if so, to what kind of school.

There are, of course, additional examples of vested interest which have complicated the implementation of reform. A key to the success of the Gesamtschule is the development of a teacher reward system which equates the salary, prestige, and other benefits of that school with the appeal of the Gymnasium--not an easy task given the stratification which characterizes the teaching community. As mentioned earlier, the planned revisions in secondary education which affect the style of vocational education and the apprenticeship system come into conflict with another governmental bureaucracy (the various state ministries of labor) and with the political tie between the labor ministries and industry. In higher education reform, the great power and tradition of the German professorship requires a very slow and careful movement toward any change in university admissions, patterns of study, or faculty working conditions.

In sum, the comprehensiveness of Germany's General Plan for Education creates a rather vast array of interlocking barriers against the accomplishment of reform.

Since its provisions create critical and salient issues in the areas of teacher politics, parental rights, church-state relations, governmental bureaucratic infighting, federal versus state control, on-the-job versus in-school training, and the "lehrfreiheit" of university faculties--the General Plan as a result is pulled hither and yon, from one conflict to another, whenever each piece of the plan is suggested for implementation. Because it is comprehensive and integrated, with each of its reform ideas supporting others, the Plan opens itself to innumerable coalitions of interest which, although often in uneasy alliances, are able to slow considerably the pace of reform.

The Need for Implementation Strategies

A second, and related, lesson from the German experience is that informed educational planning requires careful attention to strategies for plan implementation--strategies which go far beyond the simple goals and provisions of the plan itself. The 1973 product of the Bund-Länder Commission for Educational Planning (General Plan for Education) is a typical statement of need for reform, targets of educational policy, proposed time elements for goal attainment, and projected costs of reform. The General Plan does not offer a prescription for implementation. This task, the job of the past two years, has largely been left to the Standing Conference of Education Ministers and to the individual states.[15]

It would appear that a major weakness in the Plan, and a major factor in the slow pace of reform since 1973 is the lack of clear interim policies toward the attainment of target goals.. A prime example in this regard is the story of the Gesamtschule. The Gesamtschule (comprehensive school) is a key component in efforts by Germany's planners to extend educational opportunities. However, during the past two years the nation has enjoyed little systematic discussion of, or direction over, the various Gesamtschulen which have been established. Large numbers of institutions were given the label "Gesamtschule" when the term first

became popular; most of these labels have since been removed. The remaining institutions are now considered highly experimental--and almost all are now involved in very difficult struggles to create curricula, attract and train teachers, properly allocate students, improve a fading image, show some degree of success, and simply survive.

As the Gesamtschulen experiments have proceeded, the difficulties of educational reform have become highly visible. Teachers are now becoming reluctant to work in the comprehensive schools because the long hours of work in curriculum development, pupil evaluation, etc. are generally not accompanied by additional compensation nor does the work receive anywhere near the prestige accorded employment in the Gymnasium. Curriculum ideas calling for a combined general educational background plus opportunities for the development of special pupil inclinations and talents have in practice been extremely difficult to structure within the Gesamtschule framework. A phase of "orientation studies" in secondary education stage I has been difficult to implement, because of the great lack of German experience with, and training in, the field of student counseling. Evaluations of the Gesamtschule experiments have tended to be haphazard. Each of the existing schools is engaging in some degree of self-evaluation (usually with the help of outside consultants); but nowhere throughout the Federal Republic, in 1975, is there a well-designed and well-controlled comparative evaluation of the Gesamtschule against other types of institutions.

In short, the General Plan's policy intiative, calling for the nationwide implementation of the idea of the "comprehensive school" in secondary education, has demonstrated upon implementation the lack of effective interim planning. Plans for a phasing-in of reform, for systematic research into curriculum and teaching methodology problems, and for a well-designed evaluation scheme have not been developed. The lack of such planning has seriously damaged the credibility of the

reform movement. Parents are now becoming extremely reluctant to send their children to the experimental Gesamtschulen.[16] Without a base of support in carefully developed strategies for policy implementation, ideas about comprehensive schools, or other General Plan reforms, are currently in considerable danger of succumbing to mounting criticisms regarding poor administration and ill-considered policy leadership.

Planning as Side-Effect

Finally, a third lesson from Germany's General Plan experience is that educational planning should be cognizant of, and perhaps even frequently designed in terms of, its numerous latent functions. Some of the side-effects of the German educational reform movement appear to be quite as significant as the Plan itself. It would appear, for example that there has been a major impact upon the structure and the methodology of the Gymnasium. The secondary stage I proposals offer an apparent threat to the traditional Gymnasium and to the separate, elite status of the Gymnasium teacher. In response to this threat, the Gymnasium throughout Germany has been engaged in a rather thorough renovation of its own curriculum. The number of courses available to students has mushroomed, student options and opportunities for flexibility in subject-area concentration are being introduced, the rigidity of the Abitur exam is being loosened with more student choice of examination topics, student counseling is being introduced, and time frames for the sequence of Gymnasium studies are being opened up to give students opportunities to move at differential rates toward the Abitur. In short, as an obvious defensive move under the pressure of educational reform, the Gymnasim is beginning to take on a number of the characteristics associated with the Gesamtschule.

A second, and related, side-effect is the current widespread attention given to Chancegleichkeit in German education. In recent years, Gymnasium teachers and administrators have altered considerably the tough-minded sorting-out function

of the Abitur examination. Few (less than two percent) of the Gymnasium students now fail the Abitur, the strict and rigid formality of the examination itself is passing from the scene in most schools, and the mood among Gymnasium staff almost everywhere is one of helpfulness--each student should be given every opportunity to take and pass the leaving examination. The effect of all this, of course, is readily apparent in the current glut of university entrants. The percentage of each age group becoming Abiturenten and seeking university entrance has suddenly passed far beyond all reasonable expectation.

Of perhaps even greater importance in terms of "Chancegleichkeit," however, is a new interest at the local level in exploring matters of distribution of educational achievement. In the heavily industrialized city of Essen, for example, a full-scale city-sponsored investigation was conducted in the 1970's, for the first time, into relations between social class and educational attainment--pointing out wide disparities in achievement and in the availability of school facilities between the lower-class northern portion of the city and the wealthy south. In Essen and in many other German communities, as a consequence, committees of parents (Elternvertreter) which traditionally have little voice in school management are developing an increasing awareness of, and interest in, school affairs and the distribution of school resources.

In higher education, the effect of educational reform appears to have had an impact similar to that upon the Gymnasium. University faculties have been extremely reluctant to countenance the implementation of comprehensive universities (Gesamthochschulen), where the traditionally less prestigious pedagogical colleges, technical and engineering schools, and schools of art and music are integrated into the university structure.[17] Among conservatives and traditionalists, there is a fear that the great theoretical and scientific demeanor of the German university may be diminished by too close an association with the heavy vocational orientation

characterizing other elements of higher education. Among the faculties of the less prestigious institutions, there is also a reluctance to integrate--based upon a fear that their organizations may be overwhelmed by the power of the traditional faculties and that they as a staff (because on the average they carry less exalted academic credentials) will be second-class Gesamthochschule citizens.

Many of the state ministries for higher education (Behörder für Wissenschaft und Kunst) have pushed hard for comprehensive universities, and nearly all of the facilities construction currently underway in the Federal Republic carries this philosophy. Here, one of the few weapons available to the national government has been brought to bear, for the federal government underwrites fifty percent of the cost of new construction in the tertiary sector--thus insuring itself a powerful voice in the direction of higher education affairs. As this governmental pressure has been brought to bear upon existing institutions, the universities (like their relatives, the Gymnasia) have initiated a number of activities which are in the spirit of reformist thought. University departments are joining faculties of technical colleges (Technische Fachhochschulen), for example, in cooperative teaching and research relationships in specialized areas. A prime example is a relationship between the University of Hamburg and the Technische Fachhochschule of Hamburg to train people for the maritime construction industry. In Hamburg there is much pressure upon the university to "go comprehensive." Other relationships commonly being established bring teacher training institutions (Pedagogische Hochschulen) and the universities into cooperative contact to deal with matters of training and curriculum in the spirit of the secondary stage I and stage II reforms. In Berlin, for example, a venture of this type which was established as an institute (Institute für Sozialpedogogik und Erwachsenbildung der Freien Universitität Berlin) is now fighiting for formal status and recognition within the structure of the

Free University. Although such ventures and special purpose relationships are clearly designed frequently to give impressions of readiness for reform while in fact changing little, the effect of the General Plan is that the extreme insularity which characterizes the various forms of higher education in Germany may be breaking down.

In sum, the experience of Germany's educational movement is that the implementation of change, albeit slow and continuously faced with controversy, has not been without some consequence. Perhaps a dictum here is that when little seems to be happening and it appears that nicely conceived goals are floundering upon sands of constantly shifting political controversy, it should be remembered that the planning process itself carries with it at least some germs of latent effect. Germany's General Plan for Education, whether fully implemented or not, has at least been a powerful stimulant to a nationwide discussion of its schooling system.

References

1. General Plan for Education, Bund-Länder Commission for Education Planning, Federal Republic of Germany (abridged, English translation version), Bonn (Germany), 1973.

2. T. Husen, "A Case Study in Policy-oriented Research: The Swedish School Reforms," The School Review, August, 1965, p. 223,

3. Reviews of National Policies for Education, Germany, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Paris, 1972, p. 55.

4. The authors of the OECD report were fully aware of the work that was then going on in the Federal-State Commission. In their discussion of the Commission, the OECD reviews wrote:

> For the first time, then, in the modern history of education in Germany, there is now a national body responsible for planning the development of education at all levels, from kindergarten through higher education; and responsible also for drafting a unified budget for the fulfilment of this plan. From the creation and labours of such a body, it may be hoped, some might consequences for education will flow.

See Reviews of National Policies for Education, Germany, op. cit,. p. 32.

5. Note: The Hauptschule prepares young people for entry into apprenticeships and jobs and the lower-status, blue-collar occupations. The Realschule prepares people for middle strata, white-collar type positions; while the Gymnasium provides intellectually demanding preparation for the university and high employment status.

6. For a review of post-war efforts to achieve school "comprehensivization" in Germany, see A. J. Heidenheimer, "The Politics of Educational Reform: Explaining Different Outcomes of School Comprehensivization Attempts in Sweden and West Germany," Comparative Education Review, Vol. 18, No. 3, October, 1974.

7. Personal communication with the Associate Director, Max Planck Institute for Educational Research, Berlin, July, 1975.

8. See, R. L. Merritt, E. P. Flerlage, and A. J. Merritt, "Democratizing West German Education," Comparative Education, Vol. 7, No. 3, December, 1971, pp. 121-136.

9. In the opinion of many, the biggest single factor in an arousal of public interest in educational reform was the publication of Die Deutsche Bildungskatastrophe (The German Educational Catastrophe) by George Picht in 1965. Picht argued that a failure to expand the school system was resulting in a dangerous and chronic shortage of young people who had completed the Abitur. Now, ten years later, the natior has discovered itself to be flooded

References (Cont'd)

by Abiturenten. See, A. Hearndon, "Inter-German Relations and Educational Policy," Comparative Education, Vol. 9, No. 1, March, 1973, p. 9.

10. General Plan for Education, op. cit., pp. 50-52.

11. Germany's Federal Ministry of Science and Education proposed that there should be just one comprehensive institution of higher education, the Gesamthochschule, throughout the Federal Republic. For background, see: M. Krueger and B. Wallisch-Prinz, "University Reform in Progress: The Current Debate in West Germany," Comparative Education Review, Vol. 16, No. 2, June, 1972, pp. 340-351.

12. Note: There's a language difficulty here. The term "kindergarten" is understood by Germans to apply to what we would normally call nursery school (institutions for three and four-year olds). Our kindergarten (schools for five-year olds) would, in German, be labeled "Vorklasse" (pre-schools). The use of "kindergarten" in the text above is within the context of our usage--thus the term refers to places for five-year olds (or "Vorklasse" in German).

13. See, for example, a report for the large, industrial city of Essen which shows school attendance rates for each socio-economically diverse area of that city. Struktur und Entwicklungsplan für das Essener Schulwesen für die Jahre, 1972-1985, Stadt Essen Untersuchungen Zur Stadtentwicklung, September, 1972.

14. It is only in rather recent years in North Rhine-Westphalia, furthermore, that even elementary schooling (what is now termed the Grundschule) no longer carries an identification as either Catholic or Evangelical.

15. Some of the states have in fact done a rather thorough and remarkable job of following up the General Plan with highly specific guidelines and plans of their own for the fulfilment of the various reform proposals. North Rhine-Westphalia for one, has produced a series of highly specific documents (generally one for each of the policy target areas in the General Plan) which design the shape of educational reform for the state.

16. In a recent court case of some significance, it was ruled that if school authorities assign a child to a Gesamtschule, his partents have a right to intervene if they wish and require assignment to another type of institution. The explanation given is that the Gesamtschule is considered "experimental," and no parent or child should be forced to participate.

17. In their analysis of German university reform M. Krueger and B. Wallisch-Prinz note: "Within the Gesamthochschule system, the student is able to choose between different levels of training and he is guided by his school and test performance. The reforms propose a new relationship between theory and practice," See, Krueger and Wallisch-Prinz, op. cit., p. 348.